

REMARKS

Claims 1-8, 11-12, 14-16 and 19-32 are pending in this application.

By this Amendment, claims 1, 14 and 22 are amended to recite the feature that the optical member has a maximum cross section and a lower surface, the width of the maximum cross section being larger than the width of the lower surface. See specification at, for example, Fig 1.

New dependent claims 27-32 are added to recite additional features. Dependent claims 27-29 are added to recite the features of “the base member being made of resin.” See the specification at, for example, page 9, paragraph [0080]. Dependent claims 30-32 are added to recite the features of “a height of the base member being shorter than the height of a optical member.” See the specification at, for example, Figs. 1 and 31, and paragraphs [0083] and [0084]. No new matter is added.

Reconsideration in light of the foregoing claim amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3, 14-16 and 22-26 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Kondo (JP 2001-284725); rejects claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Cox et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,782,027); rejects claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Kondo in view of Yoshikawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,154,479); rejects claims 5, 7-8 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Kondo in view of Kakimoto et al. (JP 63-007674); rejects claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Kondo in view of Kondo et al. (JP 2000-076682); rejects claims 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Kondo in view of Yoshikawa and Nakamura (U.S. Patent No. 4,706,101); and rejects claims 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Kondo in view of Aoyama et al. (JP 06-151972). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

All independent claims 1, 14 and 22, as amended, recite that the optical member has a maximum cross section and a lower surface, the width of the maximum cross section being

larger than the width of the lower surface. The applied references, either individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest such a feature.

In particular, Cox discloses an optical member 150 with a maximum cross section at its lower surface. See Fig. 12. Thus, the width of the maximum cross section equals the width of the lower surface.

Similarly, Kondo discloses an optical member 111 with a maximum cross section at its lower surface. See Fig. 1. Thus, the width of the maximum cross section equals the width of the lower surface.

Neither Cox nor Kondo discloses an optical member having a maximum cross section and a lower surface, the width of the maximum cross section being larger than the width of the lower surface. Therefore, Kondo and Cox do not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in claims 1, 14 and 22.

Yoshikawa, Kakimoto, Kondo et al., Nakamura and Aoyama do not supply the subject matter lacking in Kondo and Cox. Thus, the applied references, either individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in claims 1, 14 and 22, and claims 2-8, 11-12, 15-16, 19-21 and 23-26 depending therefrom. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-8, 11-12, 14-16 and 19-26 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a), §102(e) and §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Claims 27-32 are patentable at least in view of the patentability of claims 1, 14 and 22 from which they respectively depend, as well as for additional features they recite. For example, neither Cox nor Kondo discloses the feature "the base member being made of resin," as recited in claims 27-29, or "a height of the base member being shorter than a height of the optical member," as recited in claims 30-32.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-8, 11-12, 14-16 and 19-32 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Gang Luo
Registration No. 50,559

JAO:GXLsqb

Attachment:
Amendment Transmittal

Date: July 14, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--